

# PERC Recommendations

**July 22, 2015**

Below are the recommendations from the Professional Evaluation Review Committee (PERC) for the independent review of evaluations pursuant to §33-1004B Subsection 4. There are also additional recommendations for definitions and next steps in teacher evaluation.

## **Purpose of Teacher Evaluation**

The purpose of teacher evaluation is to enhance effective teaching, student achievement and growth by utilizing a common framework, which provides a basis for:

- personnel decisions
- professional development opportunities
- recognition of teacher performance

## **Definitions**

**Fidelity** (from Wikipedia framework for Program Evaluation): “the term fidelity denotes how closely a set of procedures were implemented as they were supposed to have been.”

**Observation** is the examination of one teaching episode. The observer documents what was seen during the teaching episode.

**Evaluation** is the determination of performance over a period of time. It includes multiple measures in order to make a determination of overall performance.

# Independent Evaluation Review Process

## Items to Review & Data Elements to Record

The following would be completed by the independent reviewers. This could be accomplished on site (district office), or electronically. Since evaluations are not due until May 1 of each year, the actual review would need to occur after.

Items Reviewed	Data Element
What are the components that were on the Individual Professional Learning Plan (IPLP)?	List components[LC1]
Does the professional practice portion include all 22 components of the Charlotte Danielson Framework – Second Edition?	Yes/No
Record the levels of performance for each component?	1,2,3,4 for each component.
What are the dates of the two documented observations?	Dates
Which additional measure(s) was included to inform professional practice?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Input</li> <li>• Parent Input</li> <li>• Portfolio</li> <li>• None</li> </ul>
Which measures were used for student achievement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ISAT</li> <li>• Student learning objectives</li> <li>• Formative assessments</li> <li>• Teacher-constructed assessments of student growth</li> <li>• Pre-and post-tests</li> <li>• Performance based assessments</li> <li>• Idaho Reading Indicator</li> <li>• College entrance exams such as PSAT, SAT and ACT</li> <li>• District adopted assessment</li> <li>• End of course exams</li> <li>• Advance placement exams</li> <li>• None</li> </ul>
What is the summative rating?	Summative Rating
Does the summative rating include combining professional practice (67%) and student achievement (33%)?	Yes/No
What is the date of the summative evaluation?	Date
Was it completed by May 1 <sup>st</sup> ?	Yes/No
Is there a written evaluation policy?	Yes/No

## Additional Data to Collect

The following would be sent to all teachers and administrators in order to collect data on the implementation of the evaluation process. The data would be disaggregated and reported.

Additional Data to Gather	
Teacher Survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Questions that would refer to same items above.</li></ul>	
Administrator Survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Questions that would refer to same items above.</li></ul>	

## Independent Reviewers

The following is a list of qualification for the independent reviewers and the list of possible independent reviewers.

### Qualifications

- Basic understanding of Danielson Framework for Teaching
- Educational/Instructional Experience
- Understanding of Educational Assessment
- Bachelor Degree
- Proficient in Microsoft Word and Excel

### List of Possible Independent Reviewers

- Teachers
- Administrators
- University Faculty/Graduate Students
- Outside Contractors
- Retired

## Random Selection

The following is the process for random selection. This would be a pilot year as this is the first year that independent reviews of evaluations will be conducted.

- All selections completed randomly.
- There are approximately 800 principals and vice-principals in Idaho.
- Randomly selecting 165 principals/vice-principals will give an 85% confidence level.
- Of the 165 principals/vice-principals chosen, randomly select 2 evaluations to review.

## Teacher Evaluation Next Steps

Is the Danielson Framework, the correct tool?

- The committee believes the Danielson Framework is the correct tool. The issue is not whether the tool is or is not the correct tool; it is whether the framework is being implemented with *fidelity*. The tool is resource intensive – hence one reason it is recognized as a valuable tool for professional growth and can be used for personnel decisions.
- PERC recommends further training in the Danielson framework for administrators AND teachers.
- PERC recommends additional funding for administrator FTE in order for administrators to be able to implement the framework with *fidelity*.

## PERC Members

- Patricia Greer, Teacher, Post Falls School District
- Charlotte McKinney, Teacher, Mountain View School District
- Karen Dillon, Teacher, Nampa School District
- Susan Webb, Teacher, Jerome School District
- Blas Telleria, Director of Human Resources, Boise School District
- Peter McPherson, Superintendent, Challis School District
- Tyler Matlock, Vice-Principal, Twin Falls School District
- David Sotutu, Principal, Marsh Valley School District
- Shalene French, Director of Human Resources, Bonneville School District
- David Brinkman, School Board Chairman, Boundary School District
- Kathy Siddoway, Retired High School Principal/Education Consultant
- Jennifer Snow, Associate Dean – Teacher Education, Boise State University
- Christina Linder, Associate Dean – College of Education, Idaho State University
- Taylor Raney, Director of Teacher Education, University of Idaho